UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,146	06/24/2003	Hoyong Lee	Lee 2-1-3	9878

46368   7590   11/25/2008
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C./Alcatel-Lucent
400 W MAPLE RD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER
NUNEZ, JORDANY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 September 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/11/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-23, 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajarajan et al. (US6950990, hereinafter Rajarajan) in view of Bocioned et al. (US20020093537, hereinafter Bocioned).

As to claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 18,

Rajarajan shows a method for displaying Web-based pages on a display device; one or more corresponding computer-readable media comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computer; and a corresponding system, comprising a memory comprising a set of computer-executable instructions and a processor coupled to the memory, the processor configured to execute the computer-executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computer; (e.g., see abstract) said method, said corresponding computer-readable media, and said corresponding system comprising:

displaying Web-based pages on a display device (column 2, lines 58-66), each Web-based display page comprising:

a first area (figure 5, element 506) that provides an ordered (Applicant fails to define this term, thus Examiner interprets this as "logical or comprehensible") list of user-selectable tasks (e.g., controls) associated with performing provisioning hardware resources (e.g., "objects relating to specific hardware units") in order to organize said compute hardware resources into a network (e.g., the hardware API is controlled by the user interface to "allow communication between the resource itself and a separate computer system" thus creating a network)(column 15, lines 2-11; column 8, lines 15-36), wherein provisioning hardware resources comprises configuring physical links or service channels among network elements (col. 11, l. 26-41; col. 37, l. 51-60; col. 38, l. 20-30) (e.g., an active directory plugin includes an explorer tool which may, for example, add, edit, activate, and/or deactivate, a user object email account -- e.g., physical link or service channel---, and the user objects may additionally include servers, databases, hosting, etc);

and a second area (figure 5, element 504) containing at least one of display information and parameter fields associated with a particular one of the user-selectable tasks, such that when a particular one of the user-selectable tasks is selected from the first area, the at least one of the information and parameter fields necessary to complete operations associated with the particular one of the user-selectable tasks are presented in the second area (column 15, lines 12-21).

Rajarajan fails to specifically show: said first area containing a graphical workflow indicator.

In the same field of invention of web page navigation of task oriented processes, Bocioned teaches: a user interface supporting navigation and concurrent application operation. Bocioned further

teaches: Subtasks being implemented within corresponding tabbed web task pages, visible tabs (e.g., tabs are a form of controls) being associated with each individual tabbed subtask web page and incorporating an identifier (i.e., graphical workflow indicator) identifying the function provided by the subtask web page (page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 1-4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rajarajan and Bocioned at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the subtasks being implemented within corresponding tabbed web task pages, visible tabs being associated with each individual tabbed subtask web page and incorporating an identifier identifying the function provided by the subtask web page of Bocioned with the method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system as taught by Rajarajan.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to simplify network implementation of business to business and business to consumer interaction for commercial transactions and **other purposes** would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Bocioned (page 2, paragraph [0016], lines 12-14).

As to claims 2, 10, 13, 19, Bocioned shows:

Wherein each of the user-selectable tasks contains a hypertext link to a particular one of the pages to enable a user to navigate through the ordered list of user selectable tasks associated with performing the provisioning of the network (abstract, lines 15-18).

As to claims 3, 14, 20:

Rajarajan and Bocioned show a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Bocioned further shows: Wherein the graphical workflow indicator includes an alphabetic indicator (e.g., nomenclature within the tab, for example, "BROWSE", "SEARCH") configured to specify (i) which user-selectable task is currently selected by the user, and (ii) where within the ordered list the user-selectable task falls (page 4, paragraph [0029], lines 8-14).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fail to specifically show: the graphical workflow indicator includes a **numeric** indicator.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the indicator functions (i.e., the nonfunctional descriptive material does not prevent the indicator from specifying). Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

As to claims 4, 15, 21:

Rajarajan and Bocioned show a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Bocioned further shows: Wherein the display information includes a map (page 1, paragraph [0004], lines 14-16).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fail to specifically show: Wherein the display information includes a map of a network.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the map is displayed (i.e., the nonfunctional descriptive material does not reconfigure the display). Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

As to claims 5, 16, 22, Rajarajan shows:

wherein the parameter fields are configured to display information entered by a user (column 15, lines 12-21).

As to claims 6, 17, 23, Rajarajan shows:

Wherein the parameter fields (figure 5, element 504 is a form) are configured to provide locations to receive information entered by a user, the information being appurtenant to the user-selectable task (column 15, lines 12-21).

As to claims 25, 26, 27, 28:

Comprising accepting user input and responsively performing the provisioning (col. 11, l. 26-41; col. 37, l. 51-60; col. 38, l. 20-30) (e.g., a plug in may be accessed which may, for example, add, edit, activate, and/or deactivate, a user object email account).

Claims 7, 11, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajarajan in view of Bocioned, further in view of Raymond (US7010593).

As to claim 7, 11, 24:

Rajarajan and Bocioned shows a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Rajarajan further shows: a console including a tool bar and three zones (figure 12, column 28, lines 30-33) and parameters being extrapolated, by the framework from the context of the user interface when a particular script is invoked (column 21, lines 64-67).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fails to specifically show: further comprising displaying a third area simultaneously with the first and second areas, the third area including at least one tip presented to a user to assist in completing one of the user-selectable tasks selected by the user.

In the same field of invention, Raymond teaches: method for dynamically providing information that is relevant to a particular problem to an administrator (abstract, lines 1-3). Raymond further teaches: a problem event being received; contextual instructions pertinent to troubleshooting the type of problem event received being generated; contextual diagnostic data pertinent to the type of problem event being generated; said instructions and diagnostic data being displayed to the network administrator on a display device for network administrator viewing (figure 7, column 19, line 65 through column 19, line 9); and a

view window having a plurality of data windows for facilitating optimal display of display space (figure 13, column 21, lines 34-45), and including instructions (e.g., tips) displayed in a data display window (column 27, line 10-14).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rajarajan, Bocioned and Raymond at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the a problem event being received; contextual instructions pertinent to troubleshooting the type of problem event received being generated; contextual diagnostic data pertinent to the type of problem event being generated; said instructions and diagnostic data being displayed to the network administrator on a display device for network administrator viewing; and a view window having a plurality of data windows for facilitating optimal display of display space, and including instructions (e.g., tips) displayed in a data display window of Raymond with the method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system as taught by Rajarajan and Bocioned.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to decrease the likelihood that an administrator will misdiagnose a problem in the evaluation of a network problem event would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Raymond (column 2, lines 48-52).

References to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims above have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Gallagher et al.   [U.S. 6314449]

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordany Núñez whose telephone number is (571)272-2753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Thursday 9am-7:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JN
11/20/2008

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175